

United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/482,235	01/13/2000	John L. Wood	OCR-729/756	6715
	7590 04/11/2003		EXAMI	JFR
Mary M Krin 79 Trumbull S	treet		COLEMAN, BRI	
New Haven, CT 06511-3708			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			1624	112
		·	DATE MAILED: 04/11/2003	19

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Application No. 09/482,235

Applicant(s)

WOOD et al.

Examiner

Office Action Summary

Brenda Coleman

Art Unit 1624



		Tipula in the same
	The MAILING DATE of this communication appears	on the cover sheet with the correspondence address
Period f	or Reply	TO THE STATE OF MONTHS FROM
THE	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.	
- Extens	ions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136 (a). In	no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the
	date of this communication. period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within t	he statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO p	period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply to seek within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the	the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any re	ply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of	this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any
_	patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	
Status 1)	Responsive to communication(s) filed on Feb 7, 20	003
2a) 🗌	·	tion is non-final.
3) 🗆		except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is
3/	closed in accordance with the practice under Ex pa	arte Quayle, 1935 C.D. 11; 453 O.G. 213.
Disposi	tion of Claims	
4) 💢	Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8-17, and 19-24	is/are pending in the application.
4	a) Of the above, claim(s)	is/are withdrawn from consideration.
	Claim(s)	
6) 💢	Claim(s) 1, 3-5, 8-17, and 19-24	
7) 🗆	Claim(s)	
8) 🗆		are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.
Annlica	ation Papers	
9) 🗆	The specification is objected to by the Examiner.	
10)	•	e a) \square accepted or b) \square objected to by the Examiner.
10,2		drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
11)□	The proposed drawing correction filed on	is: a) \square approved b) \square disapproved by the Examiner.
11/	If approved, corrected drawings are required in reply	
12)	The oath or declaration is objected to by the Exam	
,-	under 35 U.S.C. §§ 119 and 120	
13	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for foreign	priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
	☐ All b)☐ Some* c)☐ None of:	
• • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • • •	1. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	ive been received.
	2. Certified copies of the priority documents ha	
	3 Copies of the certified copies of the priority	documents have been received in this National Stage
* 9	application from the International Bur See the attached detailed Office action for a list of t	he certified copies not received.
	Acknowledgement is made of a claim for domesti	<u> </u>
	☐ The translation of the foreign language provision	
15)		
Attachi		
	lotice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) Interview Summary (PTO-413) Paper No(s)
2) 🔲 1	Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	5) Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
3) 🗀 (nformation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s).	6) Other:

Art Unit: 1624

DETAILED ACTION

Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are pending in the application.

This action is in response to applicants' amendment dated February 7, 2003. Claims 1, 13 and 17 have been amended.

Response to Arguments

Applicants' arguments filed February 7, 2003 have been fully considered with the following effect:

- 1. The applicants' amendments are sufficient to overcome the 35 U.S.C. § 112, first paragraph rejections of the last office action which are hereby **withdrawn**.
- 2. With regards to the 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph rejection labeled 9a) of the last office action, the applicant's amendments and remarks have been fully considered but they are not persuasive.
 - a) The applicants' stated that "the process is directed to the preparation of furanosylated indolocarbazoles, not any glycosylated product". However, claims 1 and 17 indicate that the final structure at the end of each of the claims is a glycosylated product. If these are not glycosylated products as pointed out by the applicants, then why is the final structure described as "a glycosylated product having the ring structure"...

Art Unit: 1624

Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 10, 13-17 and 20-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. For reasons of record and stated above.

In view of the amendment dated February 7, 2003, the following new grounds of rejection and/or reinstated rejections apply:

Claim Rejections - 35 U.S.C. § 112

The following is a quotation of the first paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall contain a written description of the invention, and of the manner and process of making and using it, in such full, clear, concise, and exact terms as to enable any person skilled in the art to which it pertains, or with which it is most nearly connected, to make and use the same and shall set forth the best mode contemplated by the inventor of carrying out his invention.

3. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendment to the process of claims 1, 13 and 17 where all of the R variables were removed leaving structures which appear to be permethylated derivatives is not described in the specification.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

4. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, first paragraph, as containing subject matter which was not described in the specification in such a way as to reasonably convey to one skilled in the relevant art that the inventor(s), at the time the application

Art Unit: 1624

was filed, had possession of the claimed invention. The amendment to the process of claims 1 and 17 where the 2nd acetal moiety contains C=X- where X is S or O is not described in the specification. This moiety in the specification is only described where a nitrogen atom is double bonded to the carbon atom.

Applicant is required to cancel the new matter in the reply to this Office action.

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

- 5. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. The following reasons apply:
 - a) Claims 1, 3-5, 9, 13-17 and 20-24 are vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the various structures which appear to be permethylated, i.e. all of the letter R's have been removed. The structures appear to be incomplete where the applicants have removed all of the R groups in view of the irrelevancy urged in the process claims.
 - b) Claim 8 recites the limitation "hydrogens and methoxys" in the furanose structure.

 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The structure of the acetal in claim 1 indicates that the structure is permethylated.

Art Unit: 1624

- c) Claim 8 recites the limitation "DMB, hydrogens and methoxys" in the structure of the final product. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The structure of the final product in claim 1 indicates that the structure is permethylated
- d) Claim 11 recites the limitation "hydrogens and methoxys" in the structure of K252a. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The structure of the final product in claim 1 indicates that the structure is permethylated.
- e) Claim 12 recites the limitation "hydrogens and methoxys as well as a hydroxymethyl" in the structure of the three species. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The structure of the final product in claim 1 indicates that the structure is permethylated.
- f) Claim 16 recites the limitation "hydrogens" in the structure of the 2,2'-biindole.

 There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The structure of the biindole in claim 13 indicates that the structure is permethylated.
- g) Claim 17 is vague and indefinite in that it is not known what is meant by the R variable in the indolecarbazole which is not defined within the claim.
- h) Claim 19 recites the limitation "hydrogens and methoxys" in the structure of
 K252a. There is insufficient antecedent basis for this limitation in the claim. The

Art Unit: 1624

structure of the final product in claim 17 indicates that the structure is permethylated.

The following 35 USC § 102 rejections are herein reinstated in view of the applicants remarks. In re Wiggins 179 USPQ 421.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless --

- (b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.
- 6. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood et al., Tetrahedron Letters. Wood teaches the process and the product by process of the instant invention. See reaction Scheme 1 and the first paragraph which states that "the enantioselective synthesis of (+)-K252a [5] via an approach involving the late-stage coupling of aglycon 8 and furanose 9".
- 7. Claims 1, 3-5, 8-17 and 19-24 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Wood et al., Journal of the American Chemical Society. Wood teaches the process and the product by process of the instant invention. See reaction Scheme 1 and paragraphs 1 and 2 which teaches the reaction of compounds 6 and 3 to obtain 1 and the reaction of compounds 4 and 5 to obtain 3.

Page 7

Application/Control Number: 09/482,235

Art Unit: 1624

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner

should be directed to Brenda Coleman whose telephone number is (703) 305-1880. The examiner

can normally be reached on Mondays and Tuesdays from 9:00 AM to 3:00 PM and from 5:30 PM

to 7:30 PM and on Wednesday thru Friday from 9:00 AM to 6:00 PM.

The fax phone number for this Group is (703) 308-4734 for "unofficial" purposes and the

actual number for OFFICIAL business is 308-4556.

Any inquiry of a general nature or relating to the status of this application or proceeding

should be directed to the Group receptionist whose telephone number is (703) 308-1235.

Brenda Coleman

Brenda Coleman

Primary Examiner AU 1624

April 10, 2003